CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
1516 NINTH STREET
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814-5512

October 14, 1999

Mr. Les Toth
5546 Old Salt Ln
Agoura Hills, CA 91301

Dear Mr. Toth:

THREE MOUNTAIN POWER PROJECT DATA REQUESTS NUMBERS 71 THROUGH 89

Pursuant to Title 20, California Code of Regulations, section 1716, the California Energy Commission (Energy Commission) staff requests that the Three Mountain Power Project, Limited Liability Company (LLC) supply the information specified in the enclosed data requests (Data Requests 71 through 89. These data requests address cultural resources, land use, noise, traffic and transportation.

Written responses to the enclosed data requests are due to the Energy Commission by November 15, 1999 or at such later date as may be agreed upon by the Energy Commission staff and the applicant. A publicly noticed workshop is tentatively scheduled for the first week in November, 1999, in Burney, to discuss these data requests. Staff will be available to answer questions regarding the data requests and the level of detail required to answer the requests satisfactorily.

If you are unable to provide the information requested in the data requests or object to providing it, you must, within 15 days of receiving these requests, send a written notice of your inability or objection(s) to both Chairman William J. Keese, Presiding Member of the Committee for this proceeding, and me. The notification must also contain the reasons for not providing the information and the grounds for any objections (see Title 20, California Code of Regulations section 1716 (e)).

If you have any questions regarding the enclosed data requests, please call me at (916) 653-1614.

Sincerely,

Richard Buell
Siting Project Manager

Enclosure

cc: Proof of Service 99-AFC-2
RKB:rkb
Datareq4.doc

Technical Area: Cultural Resources
Author: Dorothy Torres & Kathryn Matthews

BACKGROUND

Figure 4-1b was provided in response Data Request 4, submitted on September 2, 1999. This figure indicates the location of two rectangles in an area to the west of the project site. It also provides the new location of the Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) switchyard. The switchyard was formerly located to the west of the project. It now appears that the location of the switchyard has moved across the project site from west to east. The location of the new transmission line appears to have changed as a result of changing the location of the PG&E switchyard. It is not clear to staff whether the location of the switchyard or the location of the new transmission line were surveyed. In addition, representatives of the Native American community have expressed concern that survey work was undertaken without the presence of a Native American monitor.

DATA REQUEST

71. On Figure 4-1b, the rectangles situated to the west of the project site are not labeled. Please confirm that the rectangles, located to the west of the project site are the percolating ponds.

72. Please indicate whether or not the area where the new switchyard will be built has been surveyed. If it has not been surveyed, please conduct a pedestrian survey. In addition, please contact the Pitt River Tribe and obtain the services of a Native American monitor for this survey effort. Please provide the survey results.

73. What is the length of the new transmission line that will extend from the new substation location to the interconnection with the existing transmission line? Please indicate whether or not the location of the new transmission line has been surveyed. If this location has not been surveyed, please survey it. For this survey effort, please contact the Pitt River Tribe and obtain the services of a Native American monitor. Please provide the survey results.

BACKGROUND

Page 6.2-2 of the AFC identifies a portion of the land crossed by the transmission line that will be reconductored by PG&E as federal land administered by the Forest Service (Shasta-Trinity National Forest). This page also references an agreement between PG&E and the Forest Service. Staff's complete analysis must include the regulations of other government agencies.

DATA REQUEST

74. Please provide a copy of the agreement between PG&E and the Forest Service that pertains to reconductoring.

BACKGROUND

Page 5-2 of the "Cultural Resources Reconnaissance Study along the PG&E 230 kv Transmission Lines: Pit 1 1-Cottonwood, Pit 1-Pit 3, and Pit 3-Round Mountain" submitted to fulfill data adequacy in May 1999 references letters sent to Native American organizations and individuals.

DATA REQUEST

75. Please provide copies of the letters sent to inform representatives of the Native American community concerning the 88-mile reconductoring effort. These letters are referenced on page 5-2 of the Cultural Resources Reconnaissance Study indicated above.

BACKGROUND

On page 4-1 in the "Cultural Resources Reconnaissance Study along the PG&E 230 kv Transmission Lines: Pit 1 1-Cottonwood, Pit 1-Pit 3, and Pit 3-Round Mountain" submitted in May 1999, references to the Cow Creek Petroglyphs (designated SHA-00012). This site is eligible for National Register and California Register, and is located within .25 mile of the reconductoring effort.

DATA REQUEST

76. Please provide a discussion of the location of this site (under confidential cover, if the location of the site may be revealed) and the proximity of any maintenance roads, access roads or the possibility of contact with any maintenance vehicles or personnel during the reconnductoring effort. If there is a potential for contact, please describe the procedures that will be conducted to protect the site.

BACKGROUND

Staff requires additional information regarding the qualification of the personnel which conducted the cultural surveys, in order to understand the quality of surveys conducted for the project. Also, members of the Pitt River Tribe have inquired whether or not there was a Native American present when the cultural resource surveys were conducted.

DATA REQUEST

77. Please provide the resumes of all survey personnel. Please identify whether or not a Native American participated in the survey of the project site and the 88 miles of PG&E line to be reconductored.

BACKGROUND

Staff is unclear whether the Native American community is likely to be impacted by the Three Mountain Power Project. Additional information is needed to understand what land may be directly or indirectly affected by the project.

DATA REQUEST

78. Please provide, a topo base map(s) in the scale of 1:250,000, On this map(s) please begin at the area of Cottonwood as the southernmost point. The map should include Redding on the west and extend to the Oregon border on the north. The map should extend to the Nevada border on the east. On this map, please include the following:

    a. For reference, please indicate the project site location and the routes for the PG&E transmission line that will be reconductored

    b. Delineate the area illustrated in the left hand corner of Figure 3-1 (referred to by the Pitt River Tribe as the "100 mile square").

    c. Please delineate, on the map, any project affected land currently managed, used, owned, or held in trust by or for Native American Tribes. Such lands would include reservations, rancherias, trust allotments and others as appropriate.

    d. Please provide a legal definition for reservations, rancherias, trust allotments or any other types of lands held by the Native American in California. Also include information pertinent to development or use of those lands .

BACKGROUND

The AFC Cultural Resources Section concludes, on p. 6.2-17 of the AFC, that there is a moderate degree of potential for the discovery of previously unknown resources at the project site because the project area is on slightly raised ground adjacent to the Burney Valley and Burney Creek. Staff needs more information to assess the possible impacts to previously unknown cultural resources.

DATA REQUEST

79. Was a cultural resources survey conducted prior to construction of the biomass plant that is currently operating on the project site? If a survey was conducted, please provide copies of the study, findings and maps of the area or areas surveyed.

Technical Area: Land Use
Author: Gary Walker

BACKGROUND

Staff needs to know how the proposed project may affect lands under various jurisdictions. AFC Appendix A, page A-11, indicates the U.S. Forest Service owns two parcels of land within 500 feet of the right-of-way for an unspecified project linear facility. It is unclear where these parcel are on the maps provided. In order to conduct its analysis, staff needs additional information regarding ownership of lands adjacent to the transmission line proposed for reconductoring.

DATA REQUEST

80. Please provide 1:24,000 strip maps of the project, including the electric transmission lines to be reconductored, showing public and private land ownership within one quarter mile of the project. Please provide the name, address and phone number for the agency and the name of the contact person.

Technical Area: Noise
Author: Kisabuli

BACKGROUND

Staff needs to understand the project to ensure that the power plant can be constructed and operated in compliance with the Shasta County General Plan, Shasta County Noise Ordinance and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) community noise performance standards. Noise impacts are evaluated by staff using two criteria: 1) the extent to which the requirements of the General Plan, local noise ordinance or community noise performance standards may be exceeded; and 2) the extent to which sensitive receptors are affected by the projected change(s) in noise levels or tonal characteristics.

DATA REQUEST

81. Please describe the noise impact from the scheduled start-ups and shut-downs of the project and unscheduled shut-downs. If the impact analysis indicates that the project will exceed the Shasta County Noise Element or Ordinance or the EPA noise guidelines, please propose mitigation measures in order to comply with the noise ordinance and the EPA guidelines.

82. If helicopters will be used (see AFC page 6.4-20) during the construction or re-conducting of the 88-mile transmission line (TL), please estimate the extent to which these helicopters will be used, the likely noise level they will generate, location of impacts, and the length of time the noise from the helicopters will impact any single location along the TL route.

BACKGROUND

The Energy Commission generally prefers that a project not generate noise levels that exceed 5 dBA over the ambient (background) noise level at the nearest sensitive receptor. The 5-dBA increase will be compared to the lowest recorded L_{90} noise level.

DATA REQUEST

83. Please compare the estimated noise level from the operation of the proposed project, including start-ups and shut-downs, and estimate the increase due to the project at nearby sensitive receptors. For purposes of analysis/comparison, use the L_{90} noise levels. If the analysis shows that the proposed project generates noise levels that exceed the background noise levels by more than 5 dBA, please propose feasible mitigation to reduce the noise to acceptable levels.

BACKGROUND

At the Workshop of September 22, 1999 in Burney, the applicant agreed to correct data on table 6.4-4 and 6.4-5 of the AFC. Both tables define noise-monitoring locations ML1 through ML3, but the definition for these monitoring locations differ.

DATA REQUEST

84. Please clarify that ML1 through ML3 on the two tables refer to the same monitoring locations. If these locations are different, please rename the monitoring locations to avoid confusion. Please show (on a suitable map) where all the monitoring locations ML1 through ML6 are in relation to the proposed powerplant project.

BACKGROUND

Typically, the loudest noise, inherent in the construction of all projects incorporating a steam turbine, is created by the steam blows.

At the Workshop of September 22, 1999 in Burney, the applicant agreed to using the new, quieter steam blow process, variously referred to as QuietBlow® or Silentsteam™. This method uses lower pressure steam over a continuous period of approximately 36 hours. Resulting noise levels reach only about 80 dBA at 100 feet, equivalent to 40 to 45 dBA at the nearest residence.

DATA REQUEST

85. Please confirm that you will use the new, quieter steam blow process as part of the noise mitigation measures.

BACKGROUND

One possible source of noise annoyance would be strong tonal noises, individual sounds that, while not louder than the permissible levels, stand out in sound quality. To ensure the avoidance of such tonal sound, the noise control design of the project can be balanced to bring as many noise sources as possible to the same relative sound level, causing them all to blend without any one source standing out. Another potentially annoying source of noise from a power plant is the intermittent or occasional actuation of steam relief valves. The hissing noise from these valves can be largely mitigated by the installation of adequate mufflers.

DATA REQUEST

86. Please identify any tonal noise sources, and identify measures the applicant proposes to mitigate or lessen the impact of tonal noise sources.

Technical Area: Traffic and Transportation
Author: Steve Brown

BACKGROUND

Staff needs clarification of the applicant's assumptions for data responses 36 and 37 dated September 2, 1999, specifically the analysis on peak hour traffic and queuing of eastbound trucks entering the project site from State Route 299.

DATA REQUEST

87. Are all construction trips assumed to occur in the peak hour? If not, provide discussion on construction traffic throughout the day.

88. What portion of construction worker and delivery trips would occur in the peak hour? What mechanism would be used to accomplish this, and what assurances could be provided for compliance (i.e. written notice to sub-contractors)?

89. Please provide the profile of construction traffic (estimated number of vehicles and trucks by hour by month) to substantiate the claim that queues will be minimal and short-term in nature. In addition, please provide the existing hourly profile of traffic volumes (in each direction) on State Route 299 to compare peak hours of construction traffic to peak hours of State Route 299 traffic.